

SECRET

26 March 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR : Chairman, Task Force on NSCID No. 1
SUBJECT : Comments on Third Draft of NSCID No. 1

Because of prior commitments, no ONE representative can be present at the time set for Tuesday's meeting of the task force on revision of NSCID No. 1. We are therefore submitting the following written comments on certain portions of the draft, listed in the order of the paragraphs appearing in the paper:

<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Comment</u>
Preamble	See comment under II, 2.
I	Query still on including these paragraphs which may be unnecessary and could raise technical problems.
II, 2	Assuming this has been cleared by the Office of the General Counsel, its relationship to second sentence of preamble still needs clarification (e.g., which covers what type of action?). Also query on the extent to which certain statutory powers can be delegated.
III, 2	Although this is in the present NSCID No. 1, need it be made explicit here?
IV, 3, a	Alter last sentence in paragraph to read: "To the extent the Director of Central Intelligence considers necessary, such subcommittees shall have their chairmen and secretariats supplied by the Central Intelligence Agency."

SECRET

600418

~~SECRET~~

Paragraph

Comment

V, 1

Alter second sentence to read: "In the production of National Intelligence, he shall make use of existing intelligence facilities in the Central Intelligence Agency and the departmental intelligence agencies in support of such production; Provided, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall have the direct and sole ultimate responsibility for such production."

This appears to eliminate the implication in the earlier draft that other departments can produce--which they do for the NIS but not for NIE's. The second change appears to achieve the same result with less abrasive language. Also it permits taking cognizance of the fact that IAC participation in production involves, at least to some degree, the concept of "collective responsibility."

V, 4

Is the phrase "in its possession" in first line intended to assert our right to show White House or others S/S cables, etc., which we are not now permitted to publish?

VI, 2

Check date of NSC 5438, as number of paper seems to indicate 1954 rather than 1956.

Last sentence quite sweeping but might be retained as written for bargaining purposes. Should it be "source and policy or operational sensitivity"?

VI, 3

Language of second sentence also quite sweeping and may provoke strong reaction. Query whether last sentence also in "abrasive" category.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Paragraph

Comment

VI, 6

Alter last line to read "and production
relating to National Intelligence."

SECRET